Docket No.: 99-818 CON1

REMARKS

I.   Introductory Comments

The Office Action sets forth new grounds for rejecting the claims. In the Office Action, the Examiner: (1) objected to claims 19-22 because of informalities; and (2) rejected claims 19-23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,411,684 to Cohn et al. ("Cohn") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,108,534 to Bourgeois et al. ("Bourgeois").

Claims 19-23 are pending in the application. Each of claims 19-23 is in independent form. Claims 19-22 have been amended herein solely to overcome the objection to the claims set forth in the Office Action. No other amendments have been made in this paper. Claims 1-18 were cancelled previously without prejudice.

For the following reasons, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration of the presently pending claims. Further, Applicants believe that there are also reasons other than those set forth below why the pending claims are patentable, and reserve the right to set forth those reasons, and to argue for the patentability of claims not explicitly addressed herein, in future papers.

II.   Objection to Claims 19-22

According to the Office Action, "the group," as recited in each of the independent claims 19-22, lacks antecedent basis. In response, Applicants have amended "the group" to "a group" in each of these claims. Accordingly, the objection to the claims set forth in the Office Action is obviated and should be withdrawn.

Entry and consideration of the amendments to claims 19-22 are proper under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 at least because the amendments are made simply to correct informalities and do not raise new issues requiring further search or consideration. Therefore, entry of the amendments to claims 19-22 is proper under 37 C.F.R. § 116 and is hereby requested.

III.   Rejection of Claims 19-23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohn in view of Bourgeois

"To establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA

5

Docket No.: 99-818 CON1

1974)." M.P.E.P. § 2143.03. "Obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed Cir. 1992)." M.P.E.P. § 2143.01. Thus, a *prima facie* case of obviousness requires: (1) a suggestion or motivation to modify or combine the reference teachings; (2) a reasonable expectation of success; and (3) a teaching or suggestion in the prior art references of all of the claim limitations (MPEP 2143). For at least the reasons discussed below, the Office Action does not satisfy all of these requirements.

A.   Independent Claim 19

Independent claim 19 recites:

19.   A method for providing unified messaging, comprising:
    storing a plurality of input messages directed to a user, each input message being of a particular type selected from a group consisting of a voice message, a text message, and an image, wherein the input messages further identify different user destinations;
    determining the type of each input message;
    assigning an identifier for each input message based on the determined message type;
    displaying a view of the input messages, the view including information identifying and the assigned identifier for each input message;
    providing in the displayed view at least one icon associated with one of the input message types that, when selected, eliminates from the view all of the input messages except those associated with the input message type of the icon;
    receiving a signal indicating a selection to view messages identifying a particular user destination; and
    modifying the view of the input messages based on the received signal.

Contrary to the assertions set forth in the Office Action, Cohn and Bourgeois, taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest all the claim elements recited in independent claim 19.

1.   "displaying a view of the input messages, the view including information identifying and the assigned identifier for each input message;
providing in the displayed view at least one icon associated with one of the input message types that, when selected, eliminates from

6

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

the view all of the input messages except those associated with the input message type of the icon"

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner admits that Cohn "fail[s] to disclose displaying a view of the input images." The Examiner then asserts that Bourgeois teaches "displaying a view of the input messages" and "providing in the displayed view at least one icon associated with one of the input message types that, when selected, eliminates from the view all of the input messages except those associated with the input message type of the icon." Office Action, pages 3 and 4. Applicants respectfully disagree. The cited sections of Bourgeois are directed to a remote receive-only communication unit 10 that receives and records a message. Bourgeois, col. 3, lines 37-38 and col. 6, lines 33-42. Bourgeois, at col. 6, lines 42-47, discloses:

> An indicator on the display unit 20 is then turned on to indicate that a message is waiting. In one arrangement, the display unit 20 displays an icon indicative of the type of message received, so that the user can select the appropriate means to retrieve or play the message.

Thus, the icon disclosed in Bourgeois is displayed to indicate to the user of the remote unit 10 that a message has been received and is waiting. Although the icon may be indicative of the type of message received so that a user can select the appropriate means to retrieve or play the message, Bourgeois still does not teach or suggest "displaying a view of the input messages...providing in the displayed view at least one icon...that, when selected, eliminates from the view all of the input messages except those associated with the input message type of the icon," as recited in claim 19. Bourgeois does not teach or suggest that its icon is displayed in a view that also includes displayed input messages. In contrast, the display of the icon, as disclosed in Bourgeois, is performed to indicate to the user that a message has been received and is waiting, which purpose would be pointless in a display of input messages because the user would already be able to see that an input message had been received. Accordingly, Bourgeois does not teach or suggest "displaying a view of the input messages...providing in the displayed view at least one icon," as recited in claim 19.

Moreover, although Bourgeois, at col. 6, lines 44-47, discloses "an icon indicative of the type of message received, so that the user can select the appropriate means to retrieve or play the message," there is no teaching or suggestion in Bourgeois of the icon being "selected." Bourgeois also fails to teach or suggest "eliminat[ing] from view all of the input messages except those associated with the input message type of the icon," as recited in claim 19. For at least

7

Docket No.: 99-818 CON1

these reasons, Bourgeois does not teach or suggest "displaying a view of the input messages...providing in the displayed view at least one icon...that, when selected, eliminates from the view all of the input messages except those associated with the input message type of the icon," as recited in claim 19.

2.   "receiving a signal indicating a selection to view messages
       identifying a particular user destination; and
       modifying the view of the input messages based on the received
       signal"

On page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Bourgeois teaches "receiving a signal indicating a selection to view messages identifying a particular user destination" and "modifying the view of the input messages based on the received signal." Applicants respectfully disagree. The section of Bourgeois relied upon by the Examiner to reject these claim elements states:

> Signals received by the remote unit 10 are stored in the memory 18. The memory 18 may be dynamically allocated to different storage tasks in accordance with the operator customized data configuration scheme. The allocation can be directed by the user via the display control interface 20 of the remote unit 10 or by the display control unit 62 of the base station 40 in accordance with the operator customized data configuration and transmission scheme. For example, the user may allocate 60% of the memory to voice mail messages, 30% to SMS messages and 10% to calendar data, phone numbers and appointments.

Bourgeois, col. 6, lines 51-61.

The teachings of this section of Bourgeois are completely unrelated to Applicants' "receiving a signal indicating a selection to view messages identifying a particular user destination; and modifying the view of the input messages based on the received signal," as recited in claim 19. In contrast to these claim elements, the cited section of Bourgeois is directed to a user being able to allocate memory capacity for storage of different types of messages received by the remote unit 10. This disclosure has nothing to do with "receiving a signal indicating a selection to view messages identifying a particular user destination." (Emphasis added.) Accordingly, Bourgeois does not teach or suggest "receiving a signal indicating a selection to view messages identifying a particular user destination; and modifying the view of the input messages based on the received signal," as recited in claim 19. Cohn does not cure, and the Examiner does not allege that Cohn cures, this deficiency of Bourgeois.

8

Docket No.: 99-818 CON1

For any of the foregoing reasons, the Office Action fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness against independent claim 19, and the rejection of this claim under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohn in view of Bourgeois should be withdrawn.

B.   Independent Claim 20

Independent claim 20 recites:

20.   A method for providing unified messaging, comprising:
storing a plurality of input messages directed to a user, each input message being of a particular type selected from a group consisting of a voice message, a text message, and an image, wherein the input messages further identify different user destinations;
displaying a view of at least a subset of the input messages, the view including, for each input message, information identifying the message and a corresponding identifier determined based on the type of the message;
receiving a signal indicating a selection to view only messages of a particular type;
modifying the view of the subset of the input messages based on the received signal;
receiving a signal indicating a selection to view messages identifying a particular user destination; and
modifying the view of the subset of the input messages based on the received signal.

The Examiner rejected claim 20 for the same reasons used to reject claim 19. Office Action, page 3. Applicants note that, similar to claim 19, claim 20 recites "receiving a signal indicating a selection to view messages identifying a particular user destination; and modifying the view of the subset of the input messages based on the received signal." As noted above with respect to claim 19, neither Cohn nor Bourgeois (either individually or in combination) teaches or suggests at least this portion of claim 20, and therefore the rejection of claim 20 should be withdrawn. Claim 20 also recites additional elements that are not taught or suggested in Cohn and Bourgeois, some examples of which are provided below.

1.   "displaying a view of at least a subset of the input messages, the view including, for each input message, information identifying the message and a corresponding identifier determined based on the type of the message"

Claim 20 recites "displaying a view of at least a subset of the input messages, the view

9

including, for each input message, information identifying the message and a corresponding identifier determined based on the type of the message." The cited sections of Bourgeois do not teach or suggest these claim elements. As described above, the icon disclosed in Bourgeois may be indicative of the type of message received so that a user can select the appropriate means to retrieve or play the message. Bourgeois, col. 6, lines 42-47. However, for the same reasons described above in relation to claim 19, Bourgeois does not teach or suggest that the icon is displayed in a view of input messages. For at least this reason Bourgeois does not teach or suggest "displaying a view of at least a subset of the input messages, the view including, for each input message, information identifying the message and a corresponding identifier determined based on the type of the message," as recited in claim 20.

2.   "receiving a signal indicating a selection to view only
        messages of a particular type; modifying the view of the subset of
        the input messages based on the received signal"

Claim 20 recites "receiving a signal indicating a selection to view only messages of a particular type; modifying the view of the subset of the input messages based on the received signal." At best, Bourgeois discloses "that the user can select the appropriate means to retrieve or play the message." Bourgeois, col. 6, lines 45-47. However, simply selecting to retrieve or play a single message is entirely different from Applicants' recitation of "receiving a signal indicating a selection to view only _messages of a particular type_" in claim 20. (Emphasis added.) Accordingly, Bourgeois does not teach or suggest "receiving a signal indicating a selection to view only messages of a particular type; modifying the view of the subset of the input messages based on the received signal," as recited in claim 20. Cohn does not cure, and the Examiner does not allege that Cohn cures, this deficiency of Bourgeois.

For any of the foregoing reasons, the Office Action fails to establish a _prima facie_ case of obviousness against independent claim 20, and the rejection of this claim under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohn in view of Bourgeois should be withdrawn.

C.   Independent Claim 21

Independent claim 21 recites:

21.   A method for providing unified messaging, comprising:

10

storing a plurality of input messages directed to a user, each input message being of a particular type selected from a group consisting of a voice message, a text message, and an image, wherein the input messages further identify different user destinations;

determining the type of each input message;

assigning an identifier for each input message based on the determined message type;

displaying a view of the input messages, the view including, for each input message, information identifying and the assigned identifier for the input message;

providing in the displayed view a plurality of icons, each icon associated with one of the types of input messages;

inputting a signal indicating selection of one of the icons;

modifying the view of the input messages such that only the identifying information for each input message of a particular type based on the inputted signal is included in the view;

receiving a signal indicating a selection to view messages identifying a particular user destination; and

modifying the view of the input messages based on the received signal.

The Examiner rejected claim 21 for the same reasons used to reject claim 19. Office Action, page 3. Applicants note that, similar to claim 19, claim 21 recites "receiving a signal indicating a selection to view messages identifying a particular user destination; and modifying the view of the subset of the input messages based on the received signal." As noted above with respect to claim 19, neither Cohn nor Bourgeois (either individually or in combination) teaches or suggests at least this portion of claim 21, and therefore the rejection of claim 21 should be withdrawn. Claim 21 also recites additional elements that are not taught or suggested in Cohn and Bourgeois, some examples of which are provided below.

> 1.   "displaying a view of the input messages, the view
> including, for each input message, information identifying and the
> assigned identifier for the input message;
> providing in the displayed view a plurality of icons, each icon
> associated with one of the types of input messages"

Claim 21 recites "displaying a view of the input messages, the view including, for each input message, information identifying and the assigned identifier for the input message; providing in the displayed view a plurality of icons, each icon associated with one of the types of input messages." The cited sections of Bourgeois do not teach or suggest these claim elements.

11

As described above, the icon disclosed in Bourgeois may be indicative of the type of message received so that a user can select the appropriate means to retrieve or play the message. Bourgeois, col. 6, lines 42-47. However, for the same reasons described above, the cited sections of Bourgeois do not teach or suggest "displaying a view of the input messages," as recited in claim 21. Moreover, Bourgeois also fails to teach or suggest "providing in the displayed view a plurality of icons, each icon associated with one of the types of input messages," as recited in claim 21. At best, the cited sections of Bourgeois disclose only a single icon, which is different from the recitation of "providing in the displayed view a plurality of icons," in claim 21. (Emphasis added.) Applicants also point out that the Office Action fails to specifically address the claim language directed to "providing in the displayed view a plurality of icons," as recited in claim 21. For at least these reasons Bourgeois does not teach or suggest "displaying a view of the input messages, the view including, for each input message, information identifying and the assigned identifier for the input message; providing in the displayed view a plurality of icons, each icon associated with one of the types of input messages," as recited in claim 21. Cohn does not cure, and the Examiner does not allege that Cohn cures, this deficiency of Bourgeois.

> 2.   "inputting a signal indicating selection of one of the icons;
>   modifying the view of the input messages such that only the
>   identifying information for each input message of a particular type
>   based on the inputted signal is included in the view"

Claim 21 recites "inputting a signal indicating selection of one of the icons; modifying the view of the input messages such that only the identifying information for each input message of a particular type based on the inputted signal is included in the view." The cited sections of Bourgeois do not teach or suggest these claim elements. As described above, the cited sections of Bourgeois do not teach or suggest a selection of the icon disclosed in Bourgeois. Moreover, for the same reasons described above, the cited sections of Bourgeois do not teach or suggest a view of input messages. Accordingly, the cited sections of Bourgeois also fail to teach or suggest the recitation of "modifying the view of the input messages such that only the identifying information for each input message of a particular type based on the inputted signal is included in the view" in claim 21. (Emphasis added.) For at least these reasons Bourgeois does not teach

12

or suggest "inputting a signal indicating selection of one of the icons; modifying the view of the input messages such that only the identifying information for each input message of a particular type based on the inputted signal is included in the view," as recited in claim 21. Cohn does not cure, and the Examiner does not allege that Cohn cures, this deficiency of Bourgeois.

For any of the foregoing reasons, the Office Action fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness against independent claim 21, and the rejection of this claim under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohn in view of Bourgeois should be withdrawn.

D.   Independent Claim 22

Independent claim 22 recites:

> 22.   A method for providing unified messaging, comprising:
> storing a plurality of input messages directed to a user, each input message being of a particular type selected from a group consisting of a voice message, a text message, and an image, wherein the input messages further identify different user destinations;
> determining the type of each input message;
> assigning an identifier for each input message based on the determined message type;
> identifying a set of the input messages that indicate receipt within a predetermined period of time;
> displaying a view of the set of the input messages, the view including information identifying and the assigned identifier for each input message in the set, segregated by type;
> providing in the displayed view at least one icon associated with one of the input message types that, when selected, eliminates from the view all of the input messages except those associated with the input message type of the icon;
> receiving a signal indicating a selection to view messages identifying a particular user destination; and
> modifying the view of the set of the input messages based on the received signal.

The Examiner rejected claim 22 for the same reasons used to reject claim 19. Office Action, page 3. Claim 22 recites "receiving a signal indicating a selection to view messages identifying a particular user destination; and modifying the view of the set of the input messages based on the received signal." Claim 22 also recites "providing in the displayed view at least one icon associated with one of the input message types that, when selected, eliminates from the view all of the input messages except those associated with the input message type of the icon." Therefore, the rejection of claim 22 should be withdrawn for the same reasons described above

13

in relation to claim 19. Claim 22 also recites additional elements that are not taught or suggested in Cohn and Bourgeois.

For example, claim 22 recites "displaying a view of the set of the input messages, the view including information identifying and the assigned identifier for each input message in the set, segregated by type." The cited sections of Bourgeois do not teach or suggest these claim elements. For the same reasons described above in relation to claim 19, the cited sections of Bourgeois do not teach or suggest "displaying a view of the set of the input messages," as recited in claim 22. Moreover, Bourgeois also fails to teach or suggest Applicants' recitation of "displaying a view of the set of the input messages...segregated by type" in claim 22. (Emphasis added.) Applicants also point out that the Office Action fails to specifically address the claim language directed to "displaying a view of the set of the input messages...segregated by type," as recited in claim 22. For at least these reasons Bourgeois does not teach or suggest "displaying a view of the set of the input messages, the view including information identifying and the assigned identifier for each input message in the set, segregated by type," as recited in claim 21. Cohn does not cure, and the Examiner does not allege that Cohn cures, this deficiency of Bourgeois.

For any of the foregoing reasons, the Office Action fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness against independent claim 22, and the rejection of this claim under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohn in view of Bourgeois should be withdrawn.

E.   **Independent Claim 23**

Independent claim 23 recites:

> 23.   A method for providing unified messaging comprising the steps, performed by a processor, of:
> storing a plurality of input messages directed to a user, each identifying one of at least two different user destinations;
> displaying a view of at least a subset of the input messages, the view including, for each input message, information identifying the message;
> receiving a signal indicating a selection to view messages identifying a particular destination of the at least two different user destinations; and
> modifying the view of the subset of the input messages based on the received signal.

The Examiner rejected claim 23 for the same reasons used to reject claim 19 and in addition asserted that "Bourgeois teaches the method perform [sic] by a processor." Office

14

Action, page 4. Claim 23 recites "receiving a signal indicating a selection to view messages identifying a particular user destination of the at least two different user destinations; and modifying the view of the subset of the input messages based on the received signal." Claim 23 also recites "displaying a view of at least a subset of the input messages, the view including, for each input message, information identifying the message." Therefore, the rejection of claim 23 should be withdrawn for at least the same reasons described above in relation to claims 19 and 20.

15

Docket No.: 99-818 CON1

CONCLUSION

All rejections have been addressed. In view of the above, the presently pending claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested and the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue. It is believed that any fees associated with the filing of this paper are identified in an accompanying transmittal. However, if any additional fees are required, they may be charged to Deposit Account 07-2347. To the extent necessary, a petition for extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136(a) is hereby made, the fee for which should be charged against the aforementioned account.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 13, 2006　　　　　　　　By:

Joseph R. Palmieri
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No.: 40,760

Verizon Corporate Services Group Inc.
c/o Christian Andersen
600 Hidden Ridge Drive,
Mailcode HQE03H14
Irving, TX 75038
(972) 718-4800
CUSTOMER NO.: 32127

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING/TRANSMISSION (37 CFR 1.8(a))

I hereby certify that this correspondence is, on the date shown below, being transmitted by facsimile to the United States Patent Office at 571-273-8300.

Dated: April 13, 2006　　　　　Signature: _____ (Christian R. Andersen)

16